

# The Sun

FRIDAY, APRIL 21, 1911.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second Class Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.  
DAILY, Per Month..... \$5.00  
DAILY, Per Year..... 60.00  
SUNDAY, Per Year..... 6.00  
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year..... 66.00  
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month..... 5.50

Postage to foreign countries added.  
All checks, money orders, etc., to be made payable to THE SUN.

Published daily, including Sunday, by the Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 170 Nassau Street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York. President of the Association, Edward P. Mitchell, 170 Nassau Street; Treasurer of the Association, M. F. Lafan, 170 Nassau Street; Secretary of the Association, D. W. Quinn, 170 Nassau Street.

London office, 11 Abchurch Lane, 1 Abchurch Lane, Strand. The daily and Sunday Sun are on sale in London at the American and Colonial Exchange, 11 Abchurch Lane, Strand, and at the American and Colonial Exchange, 11 Abchurch Lane, Strand.

Paris office, 6 Rue de la Michodière, off Rue du Quatre Septembre (near Place de l'Opéra). The daily and Sunday Sun are on sale at Kiosque 12, near the Grand Hotel; Kiosque 17, Boulevard des Capucines, corner Place de l'Opéra; and Kiosque 18, Boulevard des Capucines, corner Rue Louis le Grand.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have their articles returned they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

## Playing the Game.

If there is fear in any quarter that the Democrats will revise all the protection out of the woolen or any other schedule of the Payne law it is groundless. Nothing could be more comical than the report that "Democrats from wool growing States view with alarm the proposal that the woolen tariffs shall be cut to the bone in some instances and in others wadded out altogether." The Hon. CHAMP CLARK and the Hon. OSCAR UNDERWOOD have no such sinister designs upon the tariff. Revenue must be raised for the support of the Government; the Democratic party is a good protectionist party, although sometimes called "free trade" by Republican orators; and sufficient duties must be spared to avoid a deficit.

It should be understood that the Democratic leaders will do nothing to spoil the chance of electing a President, and that they will leave nothing undone to promote the success of their party in the election next year. So far it has been smooth sailing. It is easy to introduce reform bills and speed them on their way by the majority vote in the House of Representatives. The Canadian reciprocity bill and the farmers' free list bill are easily prepared and launched; even a bill amending Schedule K might be steered through the House; but getting them passed by the Senate, there's the rub! Already the Democrats in the House plume themselves upon their reform measures, and it is true they have shown unwonted activity and method as well as shrewd tactical skill. The truth is that thus far they have been playing their trumps, of which they hold a good hand, but the trouble will come when they try to take tricks with the other cards. As regards general tariff revision, aside from reciprocity with Canada, they will have to reckon with recalcitrants in their own household, as well as with the Senate; and it is no part of their plan to cut deep into the protective principle, much less endanger revenue.

Their policy is transparent. They are going to put revision up to President TAFT and the Republican Senate, and in a way that makes cooperation impossible; and then they propose to go to the country and say: "We have done our best to revise the tariff, but we have failed because we do not control the Government."

## Reforming a Notorious Falsifier.

That abandoned old prevaricator the Congressional Record has again attracted the attention of the reformers and a desperate effort is making for its correction. Long it has cheerfully said the thing that is not so, made Mr. BLANK a most eloquent and forceful speaker appropriately and pleasingly rewarded with [applause] and [long continued laughter and applause on the Republican side], when as a matter of fact Mr. BLANK's voice was never heard in the House and the recorded tributes to his oratory were what he believed to be his due, not what appreciative listeners had conferred on him.

Under "leave to print" the Congressional Record has spread abroad through all the land the most grotesque misrepresentation of the vocal activities of the Representatives. Mr. CLARK of Florida has undertaken to impose on a rule that will reveal its disingenuousness. He would have compilers of the Record put above any contribution to its columns not actually delivered on the floor these distinguishing words, printed in "bold, black faced type":

"The following remarks were not delivered in the House, and are simply inserted here on request of the Honorable

Moreover Mr. CLARK would end the familiar custom under which the works of a member's favorite sociologist or statesman are embedded in the Record under "leave to print." He would close its columns to "any portion of any article, writing, speech or document not of a member's own composition, other than statistical information, except he actually reads or quotes the same while on the floor and when he is actually addressing the House." A wealth of fiction, comment, correspondence, would be excluded under this rule, and nobody would be the loser.

ever, he should be willing to win glory on the floor and not load the Record with "remarks" that were never made except to a stenographer.

## French Cities.

The figures for the census taken throughout France last month disclose the fact that Paris in the last five years has added 124,255 to its population, as against 49,325 for the previous quinquennial period. The population of the French capital to-day is 2,846,985, and Paris remains the third city of the world. But the measure of the real Paris is disclosed in the figures for the Department of the Seine, with an area of but 185 miles and a population of 3,848,018 in 1906. For the present census the figures for the department are not yet announced, but it is certain that the total will exceed 4,000,000.

The increase in the rate of growth of Paris is not peculiar to this city alone. On the contrary practically all the French cities for which the returns have been announced show a quickening rate of increase in the years between 1906 and 1911, as contrasted with those between 1901 and 1906.

The following table shows the population at the last three censuses of ten cities for which the 1911 figures are available:

	1901.	1906.	1911.
LYONS.....	459,000	472,100	520,000
NANCY.....	102,550	110,870	120,215
REIMS.....	108,385	109,593	113,372
TOUR.....	75,000	77,001	80,456
TOURNAI.....	64,000	67,001	72,194
Orleans.....	67,511	68,614	71,578
Clermont-Ferrand.....	52,823	56,363	60,679
Bourges.....	48,851	49,133	50,358
Belfort.....	32,587	34,610	36,358
La Rochelle.....	31,529	33,854	36,124
	1,041,539	1,076,961	1,164,733

The increase between 1901 and 1906 in these cities was therefore 35,362, and between 1906 and 1911 87,772, and the increase for the ten years slightly less than 12 per cent. But it will be noticed that the gain is very unevenly distributed, since 65,389 of the 1911 increase and 29,452 of the 1906 gain belong to the cities of Lyons, Nancy and Clermont Ferrand. One city, Bourges, shows a loss between 1901 and 1906 only partly made up by the slight increase disclosed at the present enumeration.

Lyons in the latest figures seems to have overcome the practical stagnation revealed in the former census, in which the gain of the Rhone city was but 13,001, as compared with 48,700 this year. But there is slight prospect that the renewed expansion will restore Lyons to second place among French cities, for the population of Marseilles in 1906 exceeded 517,000 and the growth since has been considerable. The immediate suburbs of Lyons have a population of about 100,000 and gained nearly 12,000 in the last five years. With these included it is possible that Lyons is still larger than her Mediterranean rival.

Apart from Lyons, Nancy and Clermont Ferrand, the cities shown in the table gained 8,900 in the first and 21,383 in the second period, a gain too small to indicate anything but comparative stagnation. Of these seven cities only two, Tours and Belfort, gained more than 4,500 in the latter census, or more than 5,000 in the ten years. The advance of Belfort is almost unique among French cities—it is purely and simply a growth of the last forty years. In 1871 it had less than 8,000 inhabitants, and its remarkable development has resulted from the immigration of residents of Alsace-Lorraine.

The returns for the departments are still lacking. The figures for two, the Yonne and Haute Savoie, show a marked decrease. The loss in each instance exceeds that disclosed at the previous census. It is clear, then, that the "depopulation" of the rural districts continues. There is nothing new about conditions. Savoie and the Yonne have been declining in population like many other rural departments of France for a number of years. It is practically certain from the figures now in hand that the population of France as a whole will show a gain larger than had been expected. This gain will be almost entirely confined to the cities, whose increase will more than offset the decline in rural population. But most of the cities, as the figures show, are gaining but slightly when compared with German, British or American towns.

## The Same Girl.

"No handmaid fair to draw her curled gold hair through rings of gold?" President McKinley, in his memorable speech at Buffalo in 1901, recommending reciprocity, said:

"By sensible trade arrangements which will not interrupt our home production we shall extend the outlets for our increasing surplus. A system which provides a natural exchange of commodities is manifestly essential to the continued healthful growth of our export trade."

"Reciprocity is the natural outgrowth of our wonderful industrial development under the domestic policy now firmly established. What we produce beyond our domestic consumption must have a vent abroad. The excess must be relieved through a foreign outlet, and we should sell everything we can and buy wherever the buying will enlarge our sales and productions, and thereby make a greater demand for home labor."

We do not remember who first called Reciprocity the handmaid of Protection, but it was a happy figure of speech. Republican orators used to be rather fond of talking about Miss Reciprocity. With her attractive personality and insinuating ways she was going to extend the foreign market for our manufactures. She was to be a welcome inmate and willing worker in the household of Protection. Republican spellbinders used to be very gallant to Miss Reciprocity. The Hon. PAUL HOWLAND, a Republican Representative from Ohio, concerned about her welfare, asked a pertinent question in the House on Tuesday:

"You would think, to hear the discussion in this chamber, that reciprocity was hereby 'why, we used to hear gentlemen talk glibly about reciprocity as the handmaid of protection, but what has happened to that handmaid of protection at the hands of the standpatters in this debate is simply awful."

for the Reciprocity bill: "This is another girl; this is a different girl." Whereupon Mr. HOWLAND:

"It seems to be difficult for the standpatters to locate any girl by the name of Reciprocity."

We blush for them. They have forsworn Miss Reciprocity. All their vows were false. The poor girl never got a situation, and if the standpatters had their way she would not be received into the household at all. It was that gay deceiver the Hon. JOHN DALZELL of Pennsylvania who maintained that the Republican doctrine of reciprocity signified a bargain in non-competing products only. In his remarks in the House Mr. HOWLAND proved that the argument was specious by referring to the labors of the Hon. JAMES G. BLAINE, the Hon. WILLIAM WINDOM and the Hon. WILLIAM McKINLEY for reciprocity in other than non-competing products. Speaking of the drafts of the Kaseon commercial agreements authorized by Section 4 of the Dingley law Mr. HOWLAND said:

"You can examine those treaties—the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DALZELL) can examine those treaties as carefully as he likes, and if he can find the distinction between competitive and non-competitive products as the line of discrimination along which President McKINLEY negotiated those treaties, I would be obliged to him if he would point it out, because I have not been able to find it."

It is the same girl, although the standpatters deny her. In spite of the cold shoulder they give her, in spite of their perfidy, the signs are that she is coming into the household to be the handmaid of Protection after all. So far as the House is concerned—where there are many Republicans true to her—she is doubly welcome, for almost all the Democrats smile an invitation to her. Less than two months ago the Republican party lost an opportunity to engage the lady, properly introduced with an excellent character by Mr. TAFT. Whether the Senate is cool to her remains to be seen.

## Poor Old Ragged Jeffersonian Slops!

On the concurrent resolution to ratify the income tax amendment to the Federal Constitution one Democrat, LOOMIS of Erie, voted no; and this heroic solitary somewhat abated the edge of his valor by explaining that he was some sort of an "independent" Democrat and therefore free to reject the declaration of the Rochester platform about "an amendment" and "an income tax," an indefinite phrase, by the way, not apparently committing anybody to the specific amendment that was before the Senate on Wednesday. Be that as it may, exactly one Democratic Senator gaged and did not swallow; all the other representatives of State Rights gagged and swallowed. They voted to toss away a great and fruitful part of the taxing power; they voted to give to the Federal Government what may easily be a fertile means of imposition upon the citizens of New York; voted gayly to pluck New York for the benefit of other States. So New York, as far as her Senate goes, and the Assembly is ready to follow suit, joins herself to populism and populized Democracy and Progressivism, all the descendants of Ocala and Omaha and the Farmers Alliance; and Kansas and Arkansas applauded. All right, but please throw away those ridiculous old ragged Jeffersonian slops "State Rights." A "State Rights" Democrat is as obsolete as a Barnburner or a Loco Foco.

In a report of the reciprocity debate in the House we read that after the Hon. ERENEZEE J. HILL of Connecticut had pointedly told the Hon. JOSEPH G. CANNON that he was usually mistaken when he discussed the subject, "Mr. CANNON lost his temper and accused Mr. HILL of upholding the interests of the State of Connecticut against the welfare of the whole country in tariff matters." The inference is that Uncle Joe considers the welfare of the whole country and not the interests of any industry or locality as a tariff question. Mr. CANNON is a political curiosity, then. For him the tariff is never a local question. He must have lost not only his temper but temporarily his memory.

I am not clothed with wisdom. The Scapgoat. He is involved in his own virtue.

By a vote of 24 to 3 the House Appropriations Committee voted yesterday to increase the salaries of members of the General Assembly from \$2,000 to \$2,500. The principal reason advanced was that the direct primaries had caused a heavy increase in the legislative expenses. Dispatch from Springfield, Ill.

Direct primaries will come high before the people are through with them. It is a fact that in many instances campaign expenses have practically been doubled. The candidate who receives a nomination for office is twice a candidate, and the second contest will be fought harder than the first. There will be a general increase in the State where primaries are held to increase the salaries of officeholders, and the salaries having been raised, there will then probably be another movement for the payment of all campaign expenses by the State.

The Ben Davis, that cheat of the apple family, long ago found out everywhere else, has at last been measured for its true worth by its sole remaining supporters and defenders, the Missourians. They have stripped off its deceptive mask, dissected its juicy flesh to the core and are going to pitch it over the orchard wall.

"There are probably 30,000,000 apple trees in Missouri," said W. L. HOWARD, professor of horticulture at the University of Missouri. "Of this number 75 per cent. are Ben Davis, or varieties equally poor in general qualities." Many of the orchards are of trees from ten to twenty years old, and the growers have hesitated to uproot them and to wait for a number of years for young orchards to come into bearing. But new systems of top grafting have been tried with success, and the department of horticulture has taken up the work of educating orchardists in order to rid the State of the Ben Davis and "varieties equally poor" as quickly as possible. All the hope that remains for the Ben Davis is that it has the "merit of being a first class keeper and shipper," and for this reason there may be "an excuse for growing a small percentage of the variety."

"A fallen idol," "its days are numbered," comments the Kansas City Star. "Who cares? The tasteless, juicy, tough old fraud will have few mourners."

## SUGAR AGAIN?

WASHINGTON, April 20.—While the Payne tariff bill was under consideration in 1909 a vigorous campaign to reduce the duty on sugar was carried on by an association of wholesale grocers. Firms in different States and in many cities were included in the organization. The results for which they strove were not then secured. The association is now repeating its demands, and may yet compel the attention of the Congress. The solicitude for the farmer's welfare that produced the "farmer's bill" and put his cotton baling and his baling hoops, some of his boots and shoes, his cotton gins, ploughs, harness and other commodities on the free list, in some way overlooked that important article of household economy the sugar bowl. A pamphlet issued by the wholesale grocers is probably only a preliminary wedge in the way of reminder.

The American people consumed last year about 7,500,000,000 pounds of sugar, for which they paid more than \$500,000,000. About 55 per cent. of the total supply was imported, subject to duty, and the rest was the product of Hawaii, Porto Rico, the Philippines, Louisiana, and the best sugar districts of the West. On the imported sugars \$55,000,000 in duty was paid. This is, of course, added to the price of the sugar. On the rest the people paid more than \$10,000,000 as a bonus to the producers. The grocers' pamphlet includes an interesting table showing the various steps in sugar prices on a given day, December 5, 1910:

Laid down cost of raw sugar from Surinam or Java.....	2,310 cents
Refined sugar.....	1,600 cents
Cost to refiners.....	4.00 cents
Refiners' charge of wholesaling grocers.....	4.50 cents
Wholesalers' charge to New York retail grocers.....	4.50 cents
Retailers' price to consumers.....	5.15 to 5.25 cents

These are prices on standard granulated sugar. Had the sugar come from Cuba the laid down cost would have been 2,562 cents and the duty 1,548 cents, the cost of the refinery 4 cents, and the cost of the above table 1910 the laid down and duty paid price ranged from 3.8 cents to 4.6 cents, the wholesale prices on the same days being 4.55 and 5.20 cents. A retailer who followed closely the price changes, as probably few do, would have sold his sugar on August 25, 1910, at 5 1/2 cents, and on November 3 at 5 cents. Even at its present price sugar is cheap compared with its cost in earlier years. Its wholesale price is less than half of what it was thirty years ago. The price declined about that time. In 1891 wholesale quotations reached 4.65 cents a pound, and for twenty years price changes have been only the fluctuation due to variation in the yearly supply. The average of the twenty years 1890 to 1910 was about 4 1/2 cents a pound for standard granulated. Whatever the sins of the so-called sugar trust, it cannot fairly be charged with price extortion.

The producing cost of sugar is not easily determined. It varies with locality and with seasons. Its selling prices and the division of prices among the different handlers can be ascertained at any time. It is all matter of record for many years. The import price is known and recorded. The duty, the cost to refiners, the price at which refiners have sold to dealers and the retailers' prices are all tabulated and readily available. For meat and corn, cotton and wheat we now pay prices far in excess of those of fifteen years ago, but sugar is no dearer than it was then. The larger profits of the refiners have come from the increase in their business and not from an increase in their charges for their product. In view of the facts of the industry some of the most careful students have always been puzzled about the attitude of the refining interests in the matter of the tariff. Their profits come from the conversion of raw sugar into the refined product. The lower the price the greater would be their sales. With sugar on the free list or subject to a low tariff rate the recent development of the beet industry in this country would have been impossible outside of areas in the far West, where it can stand on its own feet with little and perhaps with no assistance from the tariff. The competition of domestic beet sugars with the refined product of foreign raws would have been limited.

The McKinley bill of 1890 put raw sugar on the free list. The Wilson bill of 1894 imposed a duty of 40 per cent. ad valorem. The Dingley act of 1907 imposed specific duties, the ad valorem equivalent of which has ranged from less than 60 per cent. to more than 90 per cent., according to the fluctuations of import prices, and has averaged more than 70 per cent. Yet with all these changes the selling prices have moved through a comparatively limited range. Whether the rate should now be reduced, a proceeding that would in view of present conditions almost inevitably reduce prices, remains to be determined by the lawmakers. That an immediate considerable price reduction would follow is somewhat improbable. Free sugar would put some of the present producers out of business and so curtail the supply. The heavier demand on the curtailed supply would tend to stiffen prices until greater quantity could be obtained from outside sources, but there is no doubt that after a brief term of adjustment free sugar would reduce the selling price by 1 1/4 to 1 1/2 cents a pound. It is most probable that the retailing price would be in the neighborhood of 4 cents. This could only be effected by the destruction of some enterprises, the appreciable injury of others and a heavy shrinkage in national revenues.

A wiser course would probably be a cut to a rate of 1 cent a pound, with retention of the Cuban preferential. This would doubtless crowd out a few purely artificial enterprises whose existence depends upon an unreasonable measure of protection, but they can be spared. The danger that the refiners would grab the difference is practically removed by the fact that it is possible at any time to ascertain accurately the size of their grab. As far as profits and selling prices are concerned there is nothing in their experience in the last twenty years that indicates an unholy "greed."

A Rebus and a Sign.  
To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Who can tell when, where and by whom the following sign was exhibited in Old New York: what it particularly related to, and what business organization, then in its infancy but now very large and important, was mentioned in it?  
Sends even to the usanzas to Joe's snip reap recs  
Stet usat recs minto reap ois  
Se adveit d minto reap ois  
I would like also to say that one of the outside of Windust's Eating House (there were "restaurants" in those days) did not read "Nunquam non Paratis" the double negative locution, but the sign simply said "Paratis." The sign was "Toujours Pré," the French form of the expression, was also displayed very near the former.

CHARLES H. DAVIS.  
Fifty-eight years ago an errand boy for H. B. Jones, boot and shoe dealer at No. 10 Ann Street.  
New York, April 20.

Can King Russian If Not Talk It.  
From the Boston Evening Transcript.  
While Ambassador Kaulin is not able, mirabile dictu, to speak Russian language, he can surely sign the Russian national hymn, for it is the air to which Pope's noble poem, "Rise, Imperial Saint, Rise," has been joined, making it one of the most beautiful and uplifting hymns known to the world.

A Missouri Disaster.  
From the Armstrong Herald.  
Miss Ophelia Tatum came near what might have been a serious wreck one day last week by mistaking a horse for a man. She was riding a horse, but unfortunately only the shafts were broken.

## WAS JUDAS ISCARIOT A SYMBOL?

Professor W. B. Smith of Tulane University in the Hibben Journal.

We are not concerned with the moral quality of Iskarth's act, but only with the Evangelist's representation of the act; and the Evangelist's representation of the act, we must reaffirm that the Gospel everywhere represents it not as a betrayal but merely as a surrender. It seems curious that the same word (he was delivered up) should be used of John the Baptist, where there is no betrayal, and yet no visible propriety in the term delivered up. Who surrendered him, and why? It seems useless to conjecture. But however such questions may be answered, we may still say with perfect confidence that the Gospels everywhere represent Judas as the Deliverer up, never as Traitor.

Iskarth (Ishkarioth) is only a very thinly disguised form of the Hebrew and simply means the Surrenderer, so that the recurrent phrases of the Greek text, "Who delivered him up," "the Deliverer up," A.C., are merely translations of the epithet (Iskarioth). Iskarth (Ishkarioth) is then precisely what Wellhausen felt it must be, a "Schimpfname," a sobriquet, an opprobrious nickname—the most appropriate and effective of all names for the traitor.

It seems strange, however, that the Synoptics should have no word of condemnation for the surrenderer. Still stranger that they should never assign any motive for the surrender, especially as they are so full of motives in general. Apparently they were no wiser than the moderns, and could find no explanation. Otherwise Luke would hardly have ascribed Iskarth's conduct to the devil that had entered into him, which would seem to be a denier resort. John, according to his wont, goes much further, declaring that Judas was a thief, that Satan entered into him, who himself was a devil. All this we recognize as part of John's manner in working out his imaginary reasons rather than from the discreeter silence of Matthew, and especially of Mark, that the Evangelists could imagine no plausible reason for the betrayal. And yet the reason, had there been any, would scarcely have been the profound a secret. Moreover, even if it had not been discoverable, why were Matthew, and particularly Mark, so utterly indifferent thereto? Their fancies were lively; why did they invent a reason? The only answer would seem to be that Mark at least felt the matter was not one for the assignment of human motives, that it could not be understood in any such childish way.

If the surrender be contemplated from the side of the authorities it is equally incomprehensible. What need had they of Judas and his kiss? None whatever; undoubtedly they could have arrested Jesus at any time anywhere in broad daylight in perfect safety. His disciples seem to have been alarmed, or indisposed to much resistance, even if one cut out of an "earlet." He Himself sits apparently alone and unnoticed quietly watching the throng cast in contributions to the temple treasury. And what need to fear the people, who, if it then, what way you will, the surrender appears unmotivated, unnecessary.

But are we sure that he (Judas) was a man? To my mind he was surely not. He stands for Jewry, for the Jewish people. The scene is a necessary hypothesis, as soon as we perceive the impossibility of understanding Judas as a man. On this hypothesis everything becomes clear. The delivery was really to the Gentiles; the phrase "They (the Jewish authorities) shall deliver him to the Gentiles" seems to belong to the earliest Gospel narrative (Matthew xx, 19; Mark x, 33; Luke xviii, 32), and to lay bare the heart of the whole matter. Noteworthy that while in Matthew and Mark the surrender to the Jewish authorities is mentioned first and afterward the surrender to the Gentiles, in Luke this latter alone is mentioned. Luke certainly presents generally a younger form than Mark, but occasionally, it would seem, an older, which need not surprise us. I suggest that the oldest Gospel was of the surrender of the great idea of the Jesus, the Jesus cult, by the Jews to the heathen. This, in fact, was the supreme, the astounding fact of early Christian history, and engaged intensely the minds of men. But the Jews would find such a confession of expression by parable and by symbol in the Gospels. The wonder would be if it had not.

The story of Judas and his surrender seems to be the most dramatic treatment the great fact has anywhere received. Other less elaborate sketches are found in the parables of Lazarus and Dives, of the Prodigal Son, and of the rich one who "with lowering look went away (from Jesus)" (the law, for he had many possessions) (the law, for he had many possessions) (the law, for he had many possessions).

Official Announcements.  
To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Comptroller Prendergast has been moved to pay his respects again to Mayor Gaynor in a letter which is characteristic, as usual, for its delicate compliments. For the sake of our good name of our city the incessant bickering and strife among the official heads of this city should be stopped.

If it were not for the disgrace and injury which are a consequence of these incessant wrangles, they might be entertained with almost the beginning of the present administration each official has seemed to strive to be more vituperative than his fellow official, and the result must be a demoralization of the entire city government and a stain on the community. Dignity of office seems to be no restraint, and the conclusion is forced upon one that there has been effort to cover up weakness and incompetence under a constant outpouring of abuse and invective. Accepting the judgment of each of these officials of the other as being unprejudiced and sound, then each is either a fool or a knave, or possibly both.

I doubt if in the history of the country, certainly not within recent years, there has been a more disgraceful and shameful spectacle of official conduct than we are now afflicted with, bringing discredit on the city they have been honored to be permitted to serve. Mayor Gaynor has been the chief offender. He has quoted the Scriptures to those who have had the misfortune to incur his displeasure, and I therefore hesitate to indulge in the same amiable weakness, yet I cannot resist crying out "How long, O Lord, how long?"  
New York, April 20. J. H. B.

## The Cause of the Decrease in the Number of Private Bills.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—This morning's SUN contains this editorial statement: "The decrease in the number of private bills adopted by Congress can be explained in large measure by executive extension of the pension system, although this has apparently had little if any effect on the number of bills introduced." The decrease in the number of private bills passed is because the two pension committees of the House have recently adopted the practice of reporting no bill embodying the provisions of our country's individual bills. The chairman supplants a long procession of single rated run-abovers. Frequently one bill is passed in lieu of two hundred or more introduced.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 19.

Can King Russian If Not Talk It.  
From the Boston Evening Transcript.  
While Ambassador Kaulin is not able, mirabile dictu, to speak Russian language, he can surely sign the Russian national hymn, for it is the air to which Pope's noble poem, "Rise, Imperial Saint, Rise," has been joined, making it one of the most beautiful and uplifting hymns known to the world.

## TO RE-FORM LAW THEY UPSET.

Samuel Undermyer Offers to Help Draw New Compensation Act.

The executive officers of the department of justice's compensation of the National Civil Service Federation met yesterday at the Metropolitan Building to consider plans for uniform State legislation bearing on workmen's compensation. It was announced at the meeting that Francis Lynde Stetson has agreed to become chairman and William J. Moran secretary of a committee appointed by the federation to review the situation and recommend a policy to be followed in future regarding workmen's compensation. The other members of the committee are P. Tecumseh Sherman, Laurence Parker, chairman of the Federal Liability Commission, and M. Edizit of the Building Trades Employers' Association, and L. Gernon, chairman of the Joint Labor Conference Board of this city on workmen's compensation.

This committee was appointed by August Belmont, chairman of the workmen's compensation department, at a recent meeting in this city called to consider the effect of the decision of the Court of Appeals in the State of New York, the Wainwright compulsory workmen's compensation act unconstitutional. It will report the exact status of the legislation on workmen's compensation, and employers' liability in the different States at the next meeting of the department on May 17. On behalf of the department the following statement was issued after yesterday's meeting:

Charles H. Butler, chairman of the American Bar Association's committee on compensation, and Hollis R. Bailey, chairman of a similar committee of the commissioners on uniform State laws, have promised Mr. Stetson the help of their respective committees in the preparation of the report. The well known law firm of Guggenheim, Undermyer & Marshall, which appeared for the railway company in the case before the Court of Appeals, which unanimously declared the Wainwright act unconstitutional, has been asked to appear on the other side. In a letter to the federation, of which he is a member, Samuel Undermyer said:

"If there is anything we can consistently do to assist in securing the enactment of a proper law, we will be pleased to do it. You know that I draw a very sharp distinction between the practice of my profession and my duties as a citizen, and that I hold the latter far beyond the interests of the former."

## APPORTIONMENT LAW IN COURT.

Appellate Division Hears Argument on Its Constitutionality.

The Appellate Division of the Supreme Court heard argument yesterday afternoon on the application by William G. Reynolds and thirty others to declare invalid the present apportionment of the State into Senate and Assembly districts. The petitioners are appealing from the decision of the Supreme Court Justice Amend dismissing the petition for Justice.

The petitioners' briefs in their application on some 200 alleged violations of the "boundary block rule" by which the statutes say the districting should be made. The briefs declare that putting all the inmates of the State Prison in one district, and one inmate in another district, the Town, was a violation not only of this rule but of the Constitution.

A decision is expected at the end of the two weeks recess which will be taken by the court to-day.

## Dinner to Bishop Greer and Grant La Farge.

Mr. and Mrs. Levi P. Morton gave a dinner last evening at their residence, 618 Fifth Avenue, in honor of Bishop Greer and Grant La Farge, the architect of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine. The guests, including the trustees of the Cathedral, were the Rev. Dr. William M. Groves, the Rev. Dr. William T. Manning, the Rev. Dr. Ernest M. Stires, George McCulloch Miller, Charles F. Hoffman, H. L. Morris, H. C. Fahnestock, Prof. C. H. Burr, August Belmont, the Rev. Canon Douglas, Archdeacon Nelson and the Rev. Canon Jones.

## The Insurrection Against the Courts.

From a letter in the Houston Post.

Under the provisions of the Arizona Constitution by a simple, vigorous twist of the wheel of fortune a man could be elevated to the office of Governor to-day and tomorrow by "referendum and recall" of the mob he kicked out of the aforesaid office and the third day be riding a rural route for a business and a living. This specimen, in the last analysis, of a socialistic organism given no guidance but free to follow its own property, and there could be none when the judiciary, the keystone and the pillar both of the governmental fabric, is made responsive to every popular whim and whim. To guarantee life, liberty and property, all must be under the protection of a free and independent judiciary, as far as moved as possible from the influence and the caprice of the populace. No man's life, liberty or property is secure where the bench before the bench must receive a mass before the bench must receive a mass meeting held the day previous away off some corner of the Commonwealth, said mass meeting having adopted resolutions that the case doctored "State of Arizona vs. the Railroad Company" having reached the State Supreme Court, must be decided in favor of Arizona, against the railroad company or there would be a "recall" election to vacate the Supreme Court and elect Judges who would render such decisions.